

AD-A037 147

AIR FORCE HUMAN RESOURCES LAB BROOKS AFB TEX  
COMPARISONS BETWEEN ABBREVIATED AND CONTROLLED OFFICER EFFECTIV--ETC(U)  
AUG 76 R A BIEDIGER  
AFHRL-TR-76-53

F/6 5/9

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

| OF |  
AD  
A037147



END

DATE  
FILMED  
4 - 77

AFHRL-TR-76-53

**AIR FORCE**



AD A037147

**HUMAN**

**RESOURCES**

**COMPARISONS BETWEEN ABBREVIATED AND CONTROLLED  
OFFICER EFFECTIVENESS REPORTS**

By  
Rosalie A. Biediger

12

COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES DIVISION  
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

August 1976  
Final Report for Period 15 December 1975 - 31 March 1976

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



**LABORATORY**

**AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND  
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235**

# NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by Computational Sciences Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236, under project 6323, with HQ Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235.

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information (OI) in accordance with AFR 190-17 and DoDD 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

ROBERT A. BOTTENBERG  
Chief, Computational Sciences Division

Approved for publication.

DAN D. FULGHAM, Colonel, USAF  
Commander

ADDITIONAL TO	Write Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NTIS	Dist Section <input type="checkbox"/>
DTIC	
CLASSIFIED	
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES
DATE	ALL AND OF SPECIAL
A	

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 14 AFHRL-TR-76-53	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6 COMPARISONS BETWEEN ABBREVIATED AND CONTROLLED OFFICER EFFECTIVENESS REPORTS.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 9 Final rept. 15 December 1975-31 March 1976
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 Rosalie A. Biediger		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Computational Sciences Division Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS HQ Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62703F 16 63230415 17 04
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 11 Aug 1976
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 26 13 28 p.
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) inflation of abbreviated effectiveness reports performance evaluation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The ten performance factor ratings and the average rating in Section III of the new officer effectiveness report Form 707 were compared between controlled and abbreviated reports for 907 colonels rated during the first cycle of the system. Mean differences on ratings for all cases, by command, by two-digit duty Air Force specialty code (DAFSC), by aeronautical rating, and by component were analyzed. The objective of the analysis was to identify significantly higher levels of ratings on performance factors in abbreviated reports than for corresponding ratings in controlled reports, taking into account variance which might be introduced by changes in job or rater. Results indicate there is no significant inflationary trend in the ratings of colonels on abbreviated reports for the total population, the no-job-change subset, or the no-rater-change subset. Other results indicate that, while significant		

404 415




Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Item 20 Continued:

inflationary trends do emerge for specific commands, they are offset by trends in other commands to provide controlled report ratings that are significantly higher than abbreviated report ratings. Data are presented which suggest interactive effects between rater stability, job stability, and command and between rater stability and DAFSC.



Unclassified

## SUMMARY

In response to Requirement for Personnel Research (RPR) 75-13 from AFMPC/DPMYO, a study was initiated to compare the use of the ten performance factor ratings and the average rating in Section III of the new officer effectiveness report (OER) Form 707 between controlled and abbreviated reports. The objective of the analysis was to identify significantly higher levels of ratings on performance factors in abbreviated reports than for corresponding ratings in controlled reports, taking into account variance which might be introduced by changes in job or rater.

Under the new OER system, which became operational in November 1974, it is possible that both controlled and abbreviated reports are executed on the same ratee during an annual cycle. For controlled reports the reviewer is constrained to place a maximum of 22% of Section V (Evaluation of Potential) ratings of Form 707 in the top block and a maximum of 28% in the second block. Abbreviated reports are filled out exactly the same as controlled reports except that Section V is left blank. Normally, it would be expected that factor ratings in an abbreviated report and a controlled report written within a relatively brief time span on the same ratee in the same job by the same rater would be the same. This study addresses a concern that, because an abbreviated OER has no constrained rating distribution, in contrast to a controlled OER, the abbreviated report performance factor ratings will have a tendency to be "inflated."

A data base consisting of controlled reports written on colonels during the period 30 November 1974 through 30 July 1975 was matched against a data base of abbreviated reports on colonels received through 14 January 1976. For the resulting file of matching cases, mean values on each performance factor and the overall average rating were computed for controlled and for abbreviated reports, and the mean differences between ratings were obtained. An analysis was performed on mean differences for all cases, by command, by two-digit duty Air Force specialty code (DAFSC), by aeronautical rating, and by component. The analysis was performed for the total population, as well as for cases with no job change and those with no rater change between the two types of reports.

The matching operation between controlled and abbreviated reports resulted in 907 colonel ratees available for comparison. Based on identical DAFSCs and personnel accounting symbol codes in both types of reports, it was determined that 729 cases did not change jobs. Similarly, a match of rater names and Social Security account numbers (SSAN) for controlled and abbreviated reports on the same ratee identified 396 cases with no rater change. Three hundred and seventy-two (372) of the 396 no-rater-change cases did not change jobs.

Subgroup comparisons based on fewer than 10 ratees were excluded from the analysis. This was done in order to focus attention on major trends in the data. For the purpose of the analysis significant inflation was arbitrarily defined as a mean abbreviated report performance factor rating at least .20 greater than the corresponding controlled report rating. Similarly, a significantly higher controlled report mean was defined in terms of a mean at least .20 greater than the corresponding abbreviated report mean. Statistical tests were not performed, since the set of 907 ratees and subgroups as defined by command, duty AFSC, aero rating, and component represent the entire population and various subpopulations of ratees in the grade of colonel for whom both abbreviated and controlled reports exist. In analyzing results a tendency toward inflation was defined to exist if at least four of the 11 comparisons for a subpopulation (10 performance factors and the average performance factor rating) displayed significantly higher abbreviated than controlled report means. Likewise, a tendency in the opposite direction indicated the presence of at least four significantly higher controlled report means than abbreviated report means.

The rating scale for performance factors runs from 1.0 (far below standard) to 5.0 (well above standard). Virtually all subgroup means on both controlled and abbreviated reports exceed 4.0. In this sense performance factor ratings appear generally to be inflated regardless of the distinction between controlled and abbreviated reports.

Comparisons between performance factor rating mean values for the total population of 907 ratees resulted in no significant differences in either direction between abbreviated and controlled reports. A similar finding was obtained for the subpopulation of 729 ratees who did not change jobs and also for the 396 who did not change raters.

When the data were examined by command, a tendency toward inflation was found in Tactical Air Command, Pacific Air Forces, and U.S. Air Force in Europe. Likewise, Air Training Command,

Headquarters Command/USAF, Air University, and Air Defense Command exhibit a tendency toward significantly higher ratings on controlled reports than on abbreviated reports.

The only career field in which a tendency emerges is in Personnel Administration, in which there are significantly higher controlled report performance factor means than abbreviated report means. No aeronautical rating category subpopulation exhibits a tendency in either direction. The National Guard component consistently tends to have higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports.

The absence of a requirement to provide a Section V (Evaluation of Potential) rating in an abbreviated report does not result in the assignment of higher performance factor ratings in abbreviated than in controlled reports. While significant inflationary trends do emerge for specific commands, they are offset by other commands in which there are significantly higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports. The potential for inflation in abbreviated performance factor ratings is relatively limited in view of average rating levels above 4.0 in both abbreviated and controlled reports. This is possibly more characteristic of performance factor ratings for colonel ratees than for other officer grades. Results from this study on colonels' OERs are not necessarily generalizable to other ratee grades. Further research is needed to confirm the comparability of abbreviated and controlled report performance factor ratings across the entire grade spectrum.



## PREFACE

This work was performed under Project 6323, Personnel Management Research and Development; Task 632304, Specific Analytical Studies of the Personnel System. Work Unit 63230415 was established in response to a Requirement for Personnel Research (RPR 75-13) submitted by AFMPC/DPMYO, entitled "Comparisons Between Abbreviated and Controlled Reports."

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect an endorsement of all aspects of the report by the United States Air Force or Department of Defense.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction . . . . .	7
II. Procedure . . . . .	7
Performance Factors . . . . .	7
Analysis Design . . . . .	7
Population . . . . .	8
III. Results . . . . .	8
Performance Factor Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	8
Performance Factor Mean Differences . . . . .	8
IV. Discussion . . . . .	20
All Cases . . . . .	20
Commands . . . . .	20
Duty Air Force Specialty Codes . . . . .	21
Aeronautical Ratings . . . . .	21
Components . . . . .	21
V. Conclusions . . . . .	21
Appendix A: Commands . . . . .	23
Appendix B: Duty Air Force Specialty Codes . . . . .	24

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Performance Factor Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	9
2 Significant Mean Differences on Job Knowledge Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	10
3 Significant Mean Differences on Judgment and Decisions Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	11
4 Significant Mean Differences on Plan and Organize Work Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	12
5 Significant Mean Differences on Management of Resources Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	13
6 Significant Mean Differences on Leadership Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	14
7 Significant Mean Differences on Adaptability to Stress Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	15
8 Significant Mean Differences on Oral Communication Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	16
9 Significant Mean Differences on Written Communication Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	17



List of Table (Continued)

Table		Page
10	Significant Mean Differences on Professional Qualities Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	17
11	Significant Mean Differences on Equal Opportunity Participation Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	18
12	Significant Mean Differences on Average Rating Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports . . . . .	19

## COMPARISONS BETWEEN ABBREVIATED AND CONTROLLED OFFICER EFFECTIVENESS REPORTS

### I. INTRODUCTION

In 1974, a new Air Force officer effectiveness report (OER) system became operational. Under the new system three types of OERs are written: controlled, uncontrolled, and abbreviated. Controlled OERs are only written during the four-month window period before the close-out date. These reports are referred to as controlled because the reviewer is constrained to meet the following rating distribution: a maximum of 22% of Section V (Evaluation of Potential) ratings of Form 707 in the top block and a maximum of 28% in the second block. The reviewer has the option to distribute the remaining 50% across the bottom four blocks. Uncontrolled OERs are written during the same period as controlled reports, but only on officers serving in Air Force specialty codes (AFSC) 89XX (Chaplains) and 9XXX (Medics), and there is no rating distribution constraint. Any OER that comes due outside of the four-month controlled window period is an abbreviated report; that is, Section V of Form 707 will be left blank. In addition, if an officer will retire within 120 days of the close-out date or if he has already been selected for brigadier general, any report written on him, regardless of time period, is an abbreviated OER.

Abbreviated reports are filled out exactly the same as controlled reports except that Section V is left blank. Normally, it would be expected that factor ratings in an abbreviated report and a controlled report written within a relatively brief time span on the same ratee in the same job by the same rater would be the same. However, there is concern that, because the abbreviated report has no evaluation of potential and, therefore, no constrained rating distribution, the ratings on the ten performance factors in Section III of Form 707 will have a tendency to be "inflated." In response to RPR 75-13, Comparison Between Abbreviated and Controlled Reports, a study has been carried out to address this concern. This report presents the findings of the study.

The population selected for the study consists of colonels for whom a controlled OER was written during the period 30 November 1974 through 31 July 1975, and for whom an abbreviated OER was also accomplished and available as of 14 January 1976. These OERs constitute the first reports available on colonels under the new system and represent the earliest population on which this type of study could be carried out in the context of the new OER system.

### II. PROCEDURE

#### Performance Factors

The ten performance factor ratings in Section III of the controlled reports were compared with corresponding performance factor ratings in Section III of the abbreviated reports. For the purpose of this comparison performance factor ratings were assigned numerical values as follows: "5," well above standard; "4," above standard; "3," meets standard; "2," below standard; and "1," far below standard. "Not observed or not relevant" ratings were not converted to this numeric scale.

#### Analysis Design

Comparisons between the means of performance factor ratings on controlled and abbreviated reports were made for all cases, by command, by ratee two-digit duty Air Force specialty code (DAFSC), by ratee aeronautical rating (pilot, navigator, support), and by component (Air National Guard, Regular, Reserve). A listing of the 27 command breakouts entering this analysis is contained in Appendix A. The 39 two-digit DAFSCs entering this analysis were those DAFSCs shown on the abbreviated reports; these are listed in Appendix B.

The average of the ten performance factor ratings on each controlled and abbreviated report was computed. An analysis similar to that carried out on each performance factor was also performed on the average rating.



### Population

There were 907 colonel ratees with both a controlled and an abbreviated report. The analysis was performed for the total population of 907 cases and independently for two subsets of the population: (a) those ratees whose DAFSC and personnel accounting symbol (PAS) code remained constant between controlled and abbreviated reports, that is, for whom there was no job change, and (b) those ratees who were rated by the same individual (rater) on both reports. Of the 907 colonels in the total population, 729 did not change jobs and 396 had the same rater for both controlled and abbreviated reports. Of the 396 ratees with no rater change, 372 did not change jobs.

## III. RESULTS

### Performance Factor Means and Standard Deviations

Means and standard deviations for controlled and abbreviated reports for each performance factor and the average rating are displayed in Table 1. The data are displayed for the total population, for cases with no job change, and for cases with no rater change. Means are rounded to two decimal digits.

For the total population means range from 4.53 for Oral Communication to 4.76 for Professional Qualities for controlled reports and from 4.54 for Oral Communication to 4.72 for Professional Qualities for abbreviated reports. For those cases with no job change, means for controlled reports range from 4.54 for Oral Communication to 4.76 for Job Knowledge and, for abbreviated reports, from 4.54 for Oral Communication to 4.71 for Professional Qualities. For cases with no rater change, means for controlled reports range from 4.50 for Oral Communication to 4.78 for Job Knowledge and, for abbreviated reports, from 4.48 for Oral Communication to 4.71 for Professional Qualities.

### Performance Factor Mean Differences

Tables 2 through 12 display significant mean differences on each of the ten performance factors and the average rating for the following categories: "all cases," commands, two-digit ratee DAFSCs, aeronautical ratings, and components. Columns are included for the "total population," for those ratees who did not change jobs, and for those who did not change raters. As used in this study, the term "all cases" refers to the entire population of 907 colonels for whom both a controlled and an abbreviated report had been executed during the first cycle of the new OER system, irrespective of subpopulation category (that is, command, DAFSC, aeronautical rating, component). The term "total population" refers to all of the colonels in a specific category, regardless of a change in rater or job, for whom both a controlled and an abbreviated report had been executed.

Since statistical testing of the significance of differences between means is a technique for determining differences in the performance of two groups which are representative of larger populations with unknown but possibly different parameters, and since the data to be studied consist of ratings for the total population of colonels for whom both a controlled and an abbreviated report had been executed, statistical tests of significance are inappropriate for this study and were not performed. Mean differences for sample sizes less than 10 were treated as nonsignificant. Therefore, data selected for display on these tables (and discussed in the text of this section) are limited to those categories with sample sizes of 10 or more. For the purpose of this analysis, significance was further defined to concern only those differences where the abbreviated report mean is greater than the controlled report mean (that is, inflated) or where the controlled report mean is at least .20 greater than the abbreviated report mean. Since the primary concern to be addressed in this study is the tendency to inflate abbreviated reports, all instances of inflation for sample sizes of 10 or greater are reviewed and discussed in the Results, Section III. Conversely, instances where controlled report factors are rated higher than abbreviated report factors are not of concern and, therefore, only those controlled report means considered to be significantly greater than corresponding abbreviated report means are presented.

Cells that would have remained blank for any of the columns by following these rules are filled in with the appropriate values in order to facilitate comparisons between the three groups. A negative entry represents an instance in which the abbreviated report mean is greater than the controlled report mean-inflated, as defined for the purpose of this report. Mean differences are rounded to two decimal digits.



Table 1. Performance Factor Means and Standard Deviations

Performance Factors	Total				No Job Change				No Rater Change			
	Controlled		Abbreviated		Controlled		Abbreviated		Controlled		Abbreviated	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Job Knowledge	4.75	.51	4.69	.58	4.76	.50	4.70	.56	4.78	.48	4.70	.54
Judgment and Decisions	4.59	.63	4.59	.66	4.59	.64	4.59	.66	4.60	.61	4.57	.68
Plan and Organize Work	4.64	.61	4.61	.67	4.64	.61	4.62	.65	4.65	.60	4.61	.63
Management of Resources	4.61	.64	4.61	.68	4.61	.64	4.61	.67	4.64	.61	4.61	.66
Leadership	4.64	.63	4.63	.66	4.62	.65	4.62	.66	4.64	.63	4.63	.64
Adaptability to Stress	4.62	.66	4.60	.70	4.63	.65	4.60	.70	4.60	.68	4.58	.71
Oral Communication	4.53	.70	4.54	.72	4.54	.70	4.54	.72	4.50	.71	4.48	.73
Written Communication	4.58	.68	4.56	.70	4.58	.68	4.56	.70	4.57	.71	4.52	.74
Professional Qualities	4.76	.54	4.72	.60	4.75	.54	4.71	.60	4.77	.50	4.71	.58
Equal Opportunity Participation	4.63	.66	4.63	.68	4.63	.66	4.64	.68	4.63	.67	4.57	.72
Average Rating	4.63	.49	4.62	.54	4.64	.49	4.62	.54	4.64	.48	4.60	.54

*Job Knowledge.* Significant mean differences for Job Knowledge are displayed in Table 2 for seven commands and six DAFSCs. No significant differences were found for the other categories; that is, all cases, aeronautical ratings, and components.

For the total population there are four commands for which mean Job Knowledge is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are three commands; and for the no-rater-change group, four commands. For the total population there are four DAFSCs for which mean Job Knowledge is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are two DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC.

For the total population there are three commands for which mean Job Knowledge in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are three commands; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there are two DAFSCs for which mean Job Knowledge in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are two DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC.

Table 2 Significant Mean Differences on Job Knowledge Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.05	27	-.08	15	-.07
Air Training Command	31	.26	25	.28	8	.00
Air University	24	.41	17	.47	18	.39
HQ USAF	127	-.01	114	.02	39	-.05
HQ Command, USAF	14	.22	10	.20	5	.40
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.12	37	-.21	10	-.20
Tactical Air Command	85	-.06	51	-.10	22	-.09
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
09	30	.20	28	.21	12	.33
29	35	-.06	30	-.03	15	-.13
70	16	.44	11	.37	7	.43
79	12	-.08	11	-.09	4	.00
82	12	-.08	9	-.11	6	.00
88	16	-.06	13	.00	10	.00

*Judgment and Decisions.* Significant mean differences for Judgment and Decisions are displayed in Table 3 for nine commands, nine DAFSCs, three aeronautical rating categories, and two components. No significant differences were found for all cases.

For the total population there are four commands for which mean Judgment is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five commands; and for the no-rater-change group, three commands. For the total population there are six DAFSCs for which mean Judgment is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, three DAFSCs. For the total population there is no aero rating category for which mean Judgment is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are two aero rating categories; and for the no-rater-change group there is one aero rating category. For the total population there is one component for which mean Judgment is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there is no instance of inflation for any component.

For the total population there are three commands for which mean Judgment in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one command; and for the no-rater-change group there are no commands. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Judgment in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one DAFSC; and for the no-rater-change group there are no DAFSCs. For all three groups there are no aero rating categories for which mean Judgment in controlled reports is

Table 3. Significant Mean Differences on Judgment and Decisions  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.15	27	-.14	15	-.33
Air Training Command	31	.29	25	.28	8	.37
Air University	24	.21	17	.17	18	.16
Headquarters USAF	127	.00	114	.02	39	-.10
Pacific Air Force	50	-.04	37	-.16	10	.00
Strategic Air Command	95	-.11	73	-.07	46	.02
Tactical Air Command	85	.28	51	-.37	22	-.23
Air Force Communications Service	20	.00	17	-.06	15	.00
USAF Military Personnel Center	14	-.08	12	.00	2	.00
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
00	437	.00	348	-.02	168	.05
25	19	-.05	15	-.07	17	-.06
29	35	-.03	30	.00	15	.00
30	33	.00	30	-.07	24	-.04
40	52	-.20	40	-.15	20	-.05
64	11	-.19	8	-.12	5	.00
70	16	.43	11	.27	7	.14
79	12	-.08	11	-.10	4	.25
82	12	-.25	9	-.33	6	-.33
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Pilot	581	.01	453	-.01	240	.04
Navigator	104	.00	91	-.02	50	.10
Support	222	.03	185	.03	106	-.03
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.34	11	.28	3	.00
Reserve	12	-.17	12	-.17	8	.00

significantly greater than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Judgment in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

*Plan and Organize Work.* Significant mean differences for Plan and Organize Work are displayed in Table 4 for eight commands, 10 DAFSCs, one aero rating category, and two components. No significant mean differences were found for all cases.

For the total population, there are four commands for which mean Plan and Organize Work is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are seven commands; and for the no-rater-change group, three commands. For the total population there are four DAFSCs for which mean Plan and Organize Work is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are four DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there are no DAFSCs. For the total population there is no aero rating category for which mean Plan and Organize Work is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one aero rating category; and for the no-rater-change group there is no aero rating category. For the total population there is one component for which mean Plan and Organize Work is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

For the total population there is one command for which mean Plan and Organize Work in controlled reports is significantly greater than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are no commands; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Plan and Organize Work in controlled reports is significantly greater than in



Table 4. Significant Mean Differences on Plan and Organize Work Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.14	27	-.19	15	-.27
Air Force Logistics Command	47	.08	39	-.02	23	.00
Air University	24	.20	17	-.35	18	.28
HQ Command, USAF	14	.07	10	-.10	5	.00
Pacific Air Forces	50	.00	37	-.22	10	-.30
Strategic Air Command	95	-.01	73	.05	46	.07
Tactical Air Command	85	-.28	51	-.21	22	-.22
USAF Military Personnel Center	14	-.14	12	-.08	2	-.50
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
00	437	.01	348	-.01	168	.03
09	30	.17	28	.18	12	.25
29	35	.02	30	-.04	15	.07
40	52	-.07	40	-.08	20	.05
70	16	.56	11	.37	7	.28
73	15	-.07	13	.00	4	-.50
79	12	-.25	11	-.28	4	-.25
80	26	.15	24	.21	14	.29
82	12	-.08	9	-.11	6	-.17
88	16	.19	13	.07	10	.20
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Pilot	581	.00	453	-.01	240	.02
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.42	11	.36	3	-.34
Reserve	12	-.17	12	-.17	8	-.12

abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are two DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, three DAFSCs. For the total population, for the no-job-change group, and for the no-rater-change group, there are no aero rating categories for which mean Plan and Organize Work is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Plan and Organize Work is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

**Management of Resources.** Significant mean differences for Management of Resources are displayed in Table 5 for eight commands, 12 DAFSCs, and one component. No significant mean differences were found for all cases or for any of the aero rating categories.

For the total population there are six commands for which mean Management of Resources is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five commands; and for the no-rater-change group, four commands. For the total population there are eight DAFSCs for which mean Management is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are seven DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, three DAFSCs. For the total population, for the no-job-change group, and for the no-rater change group, there are no components for which mean Management is inflated.

For the total population there is one command for which mean Management is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one command; and for the no-rater-change group there are no commands. For the total population and for the no-job change group there are no DAFSCs for which mean Management is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC. For the total population



Table 5. Significant Mean Differences on Management of Resources  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.06	27	.07	15	.00
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.06	39	-.10	23	-.08
Headquarters USAF	123	.01	110	.01	39	-.02
HQ Command, USAF	14	.22	10	.20	5	.00
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.24	37	-.38	10	-.30
Strategic Air Command	95	-.06	73	-.02	46	.02
Tactical Air Command	84	-.22	50	-.20	21	-.25
Air Force Communication Svc	20	-.05	17	-.06	15	.00
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
00	434	-.03	348	-.02	166	.03
09	30	-.07	28	-.07	12	-.09
25	19	-.06	15	-.07	17	-.06
30	33	-.04	30	-.03	24	.00
40	52	.02	40	.00	20	.20
51	11	-.09	8	-.13	5	.00
64	11	-.09	8	.00	5	.00
70	16	.00	11	-.09	7	-.14
79	12	-.25	11	-.27	4	.00
80	26	.00	24	.13	14	-.07
82	12	-.09	9	-.11	6	.17
88	16	.00	13	-.08	10	.00
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.25	11	.18	3	-.33

there is one component for which mean Management is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; and for the no-job-change and no-rater-change groups there are no components.

*Leadership.* Significant mean differences for Leadership are displayed in Table 6 for nine commands, nine DAFSCs, two aero rating categories, and two components. No significant mean differences were found for all cases.

For the total population there are seven commands for which mean Leadership is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are six commands; and for the no-rater-change group, four commands. For the total population there are five DAFSCs for which mean Leadership is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC. For the total population there are two aero rating categories for which mean Leadership is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are two aero rating categories; and for the no-rater-change group there are no aero rating categories. For the total population and no-rater-change group, there are no components for which mean Leadership is inflated, and for the no-job-change group there is one component.

For each of the three groups there is one command for which mean Leadership is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Leadership is significantly greater in controlled than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one DAFSC; and for the no-rater-change group there are no DAFSCs. For the total population, the no-job-change group, and the no-rater-change group, there are no aero rating components for which mean Leadership is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Leadership is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

**Table 6. Significant Mean Differences on Leadership  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports**

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
Aerospace Defense Command	18	.16	13	.31	11	.37
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.06	27	-.07	15	-.26
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.02	39	-.08	23	-.05
Air Force Systems Command	86	-.02	73	.01	55	.00
Air Training Command	31	.20	25	.12	8	.00
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.18	37	-.19	10	-.30
Strategic Air Command	95	-.04	73	-.05	46	.05
Tactical Air Command	85	-.18	51	-.29	22	-.18
Air Force Communications Svc	20	-.05	17	-.06	15	.07
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
00	437	.00	348	-.03	168	.02
09	30	-.03	28	-.03	12	.00
14	26	-.04	19	.05	8	-.25
29	35	.00	30	-.03	15	-.07
30	33	.00	30	-.03	24	.08
40	52	-.11	40	-.10	20	.05
64	11	-.28	8	-.25	5	-.20
70	16	.56	11	.36	7	.42
82	12	-.09	9	-.11	6	.00
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Pilot	581	-.01	453	-.02	240	.01
Navigator	104	-.04	91	-.03	50	.00
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.34	11	.27	3	-.67
Regular	883	.01	706	-.01	385	.01

*Adaptability to Stress.* Significant mean differences for Adaptability to Stress are displayed in Table 7 for seven commands, 10 DAFSCs, one aero rating category, and one component. No significant mean differences were found for all cases.

For the total population there are five commands for which mean Adaptability is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are four commands; and for the no-rater-change group, five commands. For the total population there are seven DAFSCs for which mean Adaptability is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are three DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, two DAFSCs. For the total population and for the no-job-change group, there are no aero rating categories for which mean Adaptability is inflated; and for the no-rater-change group there is one aero rating category. There are no components for any of the three groups for which mean Adaptability is inflated.

For the total population there is one command for which mean Adaptability is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are no commands; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Adaptability is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are two DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, two DAFSCs. For all three groups there are no aero rating categories for which mean Adaptability is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Adaptability is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

**Table 7. Significant Mean Differences on Adaptability to Stress  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports**

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.17	27	-.11	15	-.20
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.13	39	-.15	23	-.26
Air University	24	.25	17	.17	18	.27
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.16	37	-.19	10	-.20
Strategic Air Command	95	-.04	73	.03	46	.07
Tactical Air Command	85	-.17	51	-.10	22	-.10
HQ Command, USAF, Special CONUS	104	.05	93	.07	43	-.02
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
09	29	.11	27	.08	12	.25
14	26	-.15	19	.00	8	-.12
29	35	-.11	30	-.10	15	-.20
40	52	-.13	40	-.07	20	-.05
55	31	.19	26	.23	13	.23
64	11	-.10	8	-.13	5	-.40
70	16	.43	11	.37	7	.28
79	11	-.18	10	-.20	3	.00
80	26	-.08	24	.05	14	.00
88	16	-.07	13	.00	10	.00
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Support	222	.04	185	.05	106	-.06
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.33	11	.28	3	-.33

*Oral Communication.* Significant mean differences for Oral Communication are displayed in Table 8 for all cases, 10 commands, 10 DAFSCs, one aero rating category, and two components.

For all cases mean Oral Communication is inflated for the total population and for the no-job-change group, but not for the no-rater-change group. For the total population there are five commands for which mean Oral Communication is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five commands; and for the no-rater-change group, six commands. For the total population there are seven DAFSCs for which mean Oral Communication is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are five DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, two DAFSCs. For each of the three groups there is one aero rating category for which mean Oral Communication is inflated. For the total population there is one component for which mean Oral Communication is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

For all cases mean Oral Communication is not significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports for any of the groups. For the total population there are two commands for which mean Oral Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are two commands; and for the no-rater-change group there are no commands. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which Oral Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one DAFSC; and for the no-rater-change group there are two DAFSCs. For all three groups there are no aero rating categories for which mean Oral Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Oral Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.



Table 8. Significant Mean Differences on Oral Communication  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
All Cases	907	-.01	729	-.01	396	.02
Commands:						
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.03	27	-.07	15	-.13
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.09	39	-.10	23	-.08
Air Training Command	31	.26	25	.24	8	.13
Air University	24	.00	17	-.06	18	.00
Headquarters USAF	127	.06	114	.06	39	-.02
HQ Command USAF	14	.28	10	.30	5	.20
Military Airlift Command	95	.07	74	.02	47	-.05
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.38	37	-.48	10	-.50
Strategic Air Command	95	-.02	73	.04	46	.07
Tactical Air Command	85	-.37	51	-.37	22	-.36
DAFSCs:						
00	437	-.03	348	-.02	168	-.02
09	30	-.03	28	-.07	12	.00
29	35	-.14	30	-.23	15	-.13
40	52	-.11	40	-.12	20	.00
55	31	.13	26	.15	13	.31
64	11	-.19	8	-.13	5	-.20
70	16	.31	11	.00	7	-.15
80	26	.15	24	.25	14	.22
82	12	-.17	9	-.22	6	.00
88	16	-.25	13	-.24	10	.00
Aero Ratings:						
Pilot	581	-.04	453	-.05	240	-.03
Components:						
National Guard	12	.25	11	.19	3	-.67
Regular	883	-.01	706	-.01	385	.01

*Written Communication.* Significant mean differences for Written Communication are displayed in Table 9 for eight commands and nine DAFSCs. No significant differences were found for the other categories; that is, all cases, aeronautical ratings, and components.

For the total population there are three commands for which mean Written Communication is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are four commands; and for the no-rater-change group, two commands. For the total population there are six DAFSCs for which mean Written Communication is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are three DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC.

For the total population there are four commands for which mean Written Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are four commands; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there are two DAFSCs for which mean Written Communication is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are two DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC.



**Table 9. Significant Mean Differences on Written Communication  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports**

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
Aerospace Defense Command	18	.22	13	.39	11	.45
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.09	27	-.08	15	-.06
Air Force Systems Command	86	.01	73	-.01	55	.06
Air Training Command	31	.29	25	.28	8	.38
HQ Command, USAF	14	.43	10	.30	5	.40
Pacific Air Force	50	-.18	37	-.32	10	.00
Tactical Air Command	85	-.45	51	-.47	22	-.27
USAF Military Personnel Center	14	.29	12	.33	2	.00
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
27	30	-.03	28	.00	24	.08
29	35	-.06	30	-.04	15	.07
40	52	-.17	40	-.25	20	.00
55	31	.13	26	.16	13	.24
64	11	-.18	8	-.12	5	-.40
70	16	.43	11	.28	7	.29
73	15	.27	13	.30	4	.00
80	26	-.11	24	-.09	14	-.21
82	12	-.08	9	-.11	6	.00

*Professional Qualities.* Significant mean differences for Professional Qualities are displayed in Table 10 for seven commands, six DAFSCs, one aero rating, and one component. No significant mean differences were found for all cases.

**Table 10. Significant Mean Differences on Professional Qualities  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports**

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
Aerospace Defense Command	18	.17	13	.31	11	.37
Air Training Command	31	.26	20	.20	8	.12
Air University	83	.16	17	.23	18	.16
Headquarters USAF	127	.07	114	.07	39	-.02
Headquarters Command, USAF	14	-.15	10	-.20	5	.00
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.10	37	-.14	10	-.10
Tactical Air Command	85	-.07	51	-.04	22	.09
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
14	26	-.12	19	.00	8	-.12
29	35	.06	30	.07	15	-.07
40	52	-.05	40	-.08	20	-.05
64	11	-.18	8	-.12	5	-.20
70	16	.25	11	.19	7	.29
80	26	-.04	24	.05	14	-.07
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Navigator	104	-.03	91	-.04	50	-.04
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.50	11	.46	3	.00

For the total population there are three commands for which mean Professional Qualities is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are three commands; and for the no-rater-change group, two commands. For the total population there are four DAFSCs for which mean Professional Qualities is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one DAFSC; and for the no-rater-change group there are three DAFSCs. For each of the three groups there is one aero rating category for which mean Professional Qualities is inflated. For all three groups there are no components for which mean Professional Qualities is inflated.

For the total population there is one command for which mean Professional Qualities is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are three commands; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Professional Qualities is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change and for the no-rater-change groups there are no DAFSCs. For all three groups there are no aero rating categories for which mean Professional Qualities is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports. For the total population there is one component for which mean Professional Qualities is significantly greater in controlled than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

*Equal Opportunity Participation.* Significant mean differences for Equal Opportunity Participation are displayed in Table 11 for all cases, nine commands, 10 DAFSCs, three aeronautical rating categories, and two components.

**Table 11. Significant Mean Differences on Equal Opportunity Participation  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports**

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
All Cases	907	-.01	729	-.01	396	.06
<b>Commands:</b>						
Aerospace Defense Command	18	.22	13	.23	11	.27
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.05	27	-.08	15	-.20
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.08	39	-.13	23	-.22
Air Training Command	31	-.03	25	-.04	8	.00
Air University	24	.09	17	.23	18	.28
HQ Command, USAF	14	.22	10	.20	5	.40
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.34	37	-.45	10	-.40
Tactical Air Command	85	-.28	51	-.25	22	-.23
USAF Military Personnel Center	14	-.07	12	-.09	2	.00
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
09	30	-.03	28	-.04	12	.00
27	30	-.04	28	.04	24	.04
29	35	.06	30	-.04	15	-.06
30	33	-.03	30	-.03	24	-.04
40	52	-.09	40	-.18	20	-.20
64	11	-.28	8	-.25	5	.00
70	16	.31	11	.18	7	.28
79	12	-.08	11	-.18	4	-.25
82	12	-.33	9	-.33	6	-.33
88	16	-.06	13	-.07	10	.10
<b>Aero Ratings:</b>						
Pilot	581	-.03	453	-.02	240	.05
Navigator	104	.05	91	.04	50	.22
Support	222	.02	185	.01	106	-.03
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.33	11	.37	3	-.67
Regular	883	-.01	706	-.01	385	.06

For all cases mean Equal Opportunity Participation is inflated for the total population and for the no-job-change group, but not for the no-rater-change group. For the total population there are six commands for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are six commands; and for the no-rater-change group, four commands. For the total population there are eight DAFSCs for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are six DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group, three DAFSCs. For each of the three groups there is one aero rating category for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is inflated. For the total population there is one component for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is inflated; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

For all cases mean Equal Opportunity Participation is not significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports for any of the groups. For the total population there are two commands for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there are three commands; and for the no-rater-change group, two commands. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group and for the no-rater-change group there are no DAFSCs. For the total population and for the no-job-change group there are no aero rating categories for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; and for the no-rater-change group there is one aero rating category. For the total population there is one component for which mean Equal Opportunity Participation is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

*Average Rating.* Significant mean differences for the average of the ten performance factor ratings are displayed in Table 12 for eight commands, seven DAFSCs, and one component. No significant differences were found for all cases or for any aeronautical rating categories.

Table 12. Significant Mean Differences on Average Rating  
Between Controlled and Abbreviated Reports

Category	Total		No Job Change		No Rater Change	
	N	Difference	N	Difference	N	Difference
<b>Commands:</b>						
Aerospace Defense Command	18	.11	13	.18	11	.21
U.S. Air Force in Europe	34	-.07	27	-.07	15	-.15
Air Force Logistics Command	47	-.02	39	-.04	23	-.04
Air University	24	.16	17	.20	18	.18
Headquarters USAF	127	.05	114	.05	39	-.01
Pacific Air Forces	50	-.18	37	-.28	10	-.23
Strategic Air Command	95	-.02	73	.02	46	.06
Tactical Air Command	85	-.23	51	-.23	22	-.18
<b>DAFSCs:</b>						
29	35	-.02	30	-.04	15	-.05
40	52	-.10	40	-.10	20	.00
64	11	-.14	8	-.10	5	-.12
70	16	.38	11	.22	7	.22
79	12	-.08	11	-.12	4	-.01
82	12	-.12	9	-.15	6	-.07
88	16	-.01	13	-.03	10	.03
<b>Components:</b>						
National Guard	12	.31	11	.26	3	-.40

For the total population there are five commands for which the mean average rating is inflated; for the no-job-change group there are four commands; and for the no-rater change group, five commands. For the total population there are six DAFSCs for which the mean average rating is inflated; for the



no-job-change group there are four DAFSCs; and for the no-rater-change group there is one DAFSC. For all three groups there are no components for which the mean average rating is inflated.

For the total population there are no commands for which the mean average rating is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one command; and for the no-rater-change group there is one command. For the total population there is one DAFSC for which the mean average rating is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one DAFSC; and for the no-rater-change group there are no DAFSCs. For the total population there is one component for which the mean average rating is significantly greater in controlled reports than in abbreviated reports; for the no-job-change group there is one component; and for the no-rater-change group there are no components.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

Virtually all population and subset performance factor mean values for colonel controlled and abbreviated reports exceed 4.0. This is an indication of general inflation for controlled as well as for abbreviated reports. Because the absolute levels of all performance factor ratings are quite high, the possibility of inflated ratings for abbreviated OERs, as discussed in this report, is extremely limited. Inflation in the context of this report must be, therefore, relatively minor.

This section will address tendencies toward significant inflation and toward significantly higher controlled than abbreviated report means for all cases and in subpopulation categories (commands, DAFSCs, aero ratings, and components). In the Results, Section III, where any degree of inflation was discussed, but only significantly higher controlled than abbreviated report means were discussed, the general trend was to highlight a larger number of comparisons where inflation was involved than where controlled report means were higher than abbreviated report means. For the purpose of the present discussion, a concentration of either positive or negative mean differences of .20 will be the criterion for significance. This definition of significance is a somewhat more rigorous criterion for measuring the extent to which performance factor ratings in one type of report exceed comparable ratings in the other type. Using this revised definition of significance, most of the highlighted results concerning inflation disappear. For the purpose of this discussion, "tendency" has been defined to include those categories which have significant values, either positive or negative, for at least four of the eleven performance factor and average ratings.

##### All Cases

When considering all cases, irrespective of command, DAFSC, aero rating, or component, there are no significant mean differences between controlled and abbreviated reports for the total population, the no-job-change subset, or the no-rater-change subset. For the total population, Oral Communication and Equal Opportunity Participation are the only performance factors that reflect even a slight increase in mean (.01) from controlled to abbreviated reports. Controlled and abbreviated report means for Judgment and Decisions and Management of Resources remain the same, while all other performance factor means are slightly higher for controlled reports than for abbreviated reports. For those cases with no job change, Oral Communication and Equal Opportunity Participation are the only performance factors that reflect an increase in mean (.01) from controlled to abbreviated reports. Means for Judgment and Decisions, Management of Resources, and Leadership are identical for controlled and abbreviated reports, while all other factor means are higher for controlled than for abbreviated reports. All performance factor means for cases with no rater change are higher for controlled than for abbreviated reports.

##### Commands

For the total population and for the no-job-change subset Tactical Air Command tends to have significantly inflated ratings and Air Training Command, Headquarters Command/USAF, and Air University tend to have significantly higher ratings on controlled reports than on abbreviated reports. In addition, for the no-job-change group Pacific Air Forces tends to have significantly inflated ratings and Air Defense Command tends to have significantly higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports. For the no-rater-change group (as for the no-job-change group) Pacific Air Forces and Tactical Air Command

tend to have significantly inflated ratings, and, in addition, so does U. S. Air Force in Europe. However, for the no-rater-change group, only two commands—Air Defense Command and Air University—tend to have significantly higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports.

#### **Duty Air Force Specialty Codes**

For all three groups no two-digit DAFSCs consistently tend to have significantly inflated ratings, while for all three groups the Personnel Administration career area consistently tends to have significantly higher ratings on controlled reports than on abbreviated reports.

#### **Aeronautical Ratings**

For all three groups no aeronautical rating categories tend to have either significantly inflated ratings or significantly higher ratings on controlled reports.

#### **Components**

For the total population and for the no-job-change group no components have significantly inflated ratings; and the National Guard component consistently tends to have higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports. For the no-rater-change group the National Guard consistently tends to have inflated ratings, while there is no tendency in any component to have higher ratings on controlled than on abbreviated reports. There are, however, only five ratees in the National Guard no-rater-change group.

### **V. CONCLUSIONS**

For all cases, irrespective of subpopulation categories, an inflationary trend in the ratings of colonels on abbreviated reports does not exist. In fact, for most performance factors abbreviated report ratings are lower than controlled report ratings, and this trend emerges both where there is job stability and where there is rater stability as well as in the total population. One explanation for this result may be that "meets standard" ratings do not require a narrative statement. In the preparation of a controlled report, which includes a Section V rating on evaluation of potential, there is undoubtedly considerable reason to substantiate top block and second block potential ratings with top or second block ratings on performance factors. In general, raters will develop narrative examples of performance to document these "above standard" and "well above standard" performance ratings. In an abbreviated report, where no Evaluation of Potential is involved, the preparation can be simplified by a more extensive use of the "meets standard" performance factor rating which does not require specific examples.

While significant inflationary trends do emerge for specific commands, they are offset by trends in other commands to provide controlled report ratings that are significantly higher than abbreviated report ratings. There is an interactive effect between rater stability, job stability, and command with regard to the existence of inflation in some cases and the degree of inflation in others. The interactions are command-unique. For two of the commands with significantly inflated ratings on abbreviated reports, Pacific Air Forces and U. S. Air Force in Europe, inflation is greater where either job or rater is held constant than for the total population. For the remaining command with significantly inflated ratings, Tactical Air Command, inflation is generally less where either job or rater is held constant than for the total population.

There is also an interactive effect between rater stability and duty AFSC. For the DAFSC with significantly higher controlled report ratings than abbreviated report ratings, Personnel Administration, the difference between ratings is generally less for the no-rater-change sample than for the total population.

In summary, with only scattered and infrequent exceptions, corresponding performance factor ratings on controlled and abbreviated reports executed on the same ratee are basically identical. A slight tendency for controlled report factor ratings to be higher than abbreviated report ratings may be accounted for by the mechanics of the rating process. Command-unique interactive effects are present in the few commands where inflation is consistently present. The extent of command inflation or of the interaction must be considered slight when it is realized that virtually all population and subpopulation mean values exceed 4.0. This study addresses only the comparison between controlled and abbreviated performance factor ratings

for colonel ratees rated in the first cycle of the new system, and results are not necessarily generalizable to other ratee grades. Variables in the rating process which lead to similar or identical performance factor ratings for colonels may operate differently at lower ratee grade levels. Further research is needed to confirm the comparison of abbreviated and controlled report performance factor ratings across the entire grade spectrum.



*APPENDIX A: COMMANDS*

Alaskan Air Command  
U.S. Air Force Academy  
Aerospace Defense Command  
U.S. Air Force in Europe  
Air Force Accounting and Finance Center  
Air Force Logistics Command  
Air Force Systems Command  
Air Training Command  
Air University  
USAF Southern Command  
HQ Air Force Reserve  
Headquarters USAF  
Air Force Data Automation Agency  
Headquarters Command, USAF  
Military Airlift Command  
Pacific Air Forces  
Strategic Air Command  
Tactical Air Command  
USAF Security Service  
HQ COMD, USAF, Special CONUS  
Air Force Communications Service  
Air Force Inspection and Safety Service  
Air Force Test and Evaluation Center  
Air Force Office of Special Investigations  
USAF Military Personnel Center

# APPENDIX B: DUTY AIR FORCE SPECIALTY CODES

DAFSC Nr (2-digit)	Career Area/Utilization Field Title
00	Commander and Director Specialties
02	International Politico-Military Affairs
09	Special Duty Identifiers
11	Operations/Pilot
14	Operations/Pilot
16	Operations/Air Traffic Controller
17	Operations/Weapons Director
18	Operations/Missile Operations
20	Operations/Space Systems
21	Operations/Special Operations
22	Operations/Navigator Observer
23	Audio-Visual
25	Scientific and Development Engineering/Weather
27	Scientific and Development Engineering/Research and Development Management
28	Scientific and Development Engineering/Development Engineering
29	System Program Management
30	Communications-Electronics
31	Logistics/Missile Maintenance
40	Logistics/Aircraft Maintenance/Avionics
46	Logistics/Munitions
51	Computer Technology
55	Civil Engineering
60	Logistics/Transportation
62	Logistics/Supply Services
63	Logistics/Fuels Management
64	Logistics/Supply Management
65	Logistics/Procurement Management
66	Logistics/Logistics Plans and Programs
67	Comptroller/Financial
70	Personnel Resources Management/Administration
73	Personnel Resources Management/Personnel
74	Personnel Resources Management/Manpower Management
75	Personnel Resources Management/Education and Training
79	Information
80	Intelligence
81	Security Police
82	Special Investigations and Counter-Intelligence
87	Band
88	Legal